



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,491	10/01/2003	Jean-Pascal Hirt	235016US26	4669
22850	7590	06/06/2007		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER FOREMAN, JONATHAN M	
			ART UNIT 3736	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 06/06/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/674,491

Applicant(s)

HIRT ET AL.

Examiner

Jonathan ML Foreman

Art Unit

3736

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-83 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,3,14-16,21,23-29,46-48,53,55-70 and 72 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-13,17-20,22,30-45,49-52,54,71 and 73-83 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/23/03;12/28/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

New grounds of rejection are contained within this Office Action. Accordingly this action has been made Non-Final.

### *Claim Objections*

1. Claim 33 is objected to because of the following informalities: "and" should be including in the claim following "50%" and "mustard seed oil". Appropriate correction is required.

### *Information Disclosure Statement*

The information disclosure statement filed 12/28/06 complies with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. It has been placed in the application file, and the information referred to therein has been considered by the examiner as to the merits. Additionally, the remainder of the previously submitted IDS filed 10/23/03 has been considered.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 71, 73 – 79, 82 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 71 recites the limitation "said volume" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 13, 17 - 20, 22 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zhang et al. (US Patent No. 6,343,717).

In regard to claims 1 & 30, Zhang et al. discloses a plurality of applicators containing different test substances (Col. 5, lines 20 – 25) each applicator comprising: a tube (40); a plug inside the tube (58); and at least one test substance (48) contained in an inside space of the tube defined at a first end by the plug, the plug being arranged, in use, to be expelled together with the test substance when said test substance leaves the inside space of the tube (Figure 3). Regarding claim 13, Zhang et al. discloses a tube, wherein the inside space is defined at a second end (46), remote from the first, by a breakable portion (42). With regard to claim 17, Zhang et al. discloses a kit, wherein the applicator includes a retaining element for retaining the breakable portion on the applicator after it has been broken off (Figure 3, 42). In regards to claim 18, Zhang et al. discloses a kit, wherein the tube (40) is provided at one end with an applicator element (72), the applicator element being separated from the test substance prior to use, by the plug (Figure 2, 58). With respect to claim 19, Zhang et al. discloses a kit, wherein the applicator element (72) is selected from the group consisting of a cotton bud (Column 5, line 62 – Column 6, lines 3), a foam bud, a felt tip, a flocked bud, and a tip made of ceramic or of sintered material. In respect to claim 20, Zhang et al. discloses a kit, wherein the tube is free of an applicator element (Figure 1). Regarding claim 22, Zhang et al. discloses a kit, wherein the plug comprises a liquid, and wherein said liquid is selected from the group consisting of mineral oils, fluorine-containing substances, and silicones (Column 5, lines 44 – 47). Zhang et al. discloses at least three applicators having different test substances (Col. 5, lines 20 – 25).

Art Unit: 3736

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 4 - 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. in view of Lewis (US Patent No. 5,947,986).

With regard to claims 4 - 6, Zhang et al. discloses the kit with all of the aforementioned elements. However, Zhang et al. does not disclose a housing including compartments in which the applicators are housed. Lewis, however, discloses a housing (50 & 80) including compartments in which the applicators are housed. The housing includes at least one compartment configured to receive a single applicator or least one compartment configured to receive a plurality of applicators (Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention in view of Lewis to incorporate a housing with Zhang et al. in order to hygienically store the applicators.

8. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. in view of Zygmunt (US Patent No. 6,488,646).

In regard to claim 7, Zhang et al. discloses all of the aforementioned elements. However, Zhang et al. does not disclose at least one bag for packaging at least one applicator. Zygmunt discloses one bag (2) for packaging at least one applicator (Figure 1). It would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 3736

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention in view of Zygmunt to enclose a bag around an applicator with Zhang et al. in order to keep each applicator sterile.

In regard to claim 8, Zhang et al. in view of Zygmunt discloses the claimed invention except for a string of bags each containing at least one applicator. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a string of bags for each of the applicators, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

9. Claims 9 and 10, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. in view of Barabino et al. (US Patent No. 4,740,194).

In regard to claims 9 and 10, Zhang et al. discloses an applicator that is labeled (Column 2, lines 57-58). However, Zhang et al. does not disclose each applicator includes at least one mark corresponding to at least one of a type of test substance inside the tube and a concentration of a compound contained in the test substance. However, Barabino et al. discloses each applicator includes at least one mark comprising one of an alphanumeric symbol and a color corresponding to at least one of a type of test substance inside the tube and a concentration of a compound contained in the test substance (Column 6, lines 6-8). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention in view of Barabino et al. to include a marking on each applicator with Zhang et al. in order to differentiate applicators and their respective content.

10. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. in view of Tobin et al. (US Patent No. 3,792,699).

In regard to claims 11 and 12, Zhang et al. discloses a kit, but fails to disclose the test substance in each tube having a volume in a range from 0.01 ml to 5 ml or 0.05 ml to 1 ml. Tobin et al., however, discloses a kit, wherein the tube has a volume in the range of 0.01 ml to 5 ml or 0.05 ml to 1 ml (Column 3, lines 20-25). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in view of Tobin et al. to modify the volume of the tubes as disclosed by Zhang et al. to be the range from 0.01 ml to 5 ml or 0.05 ml to 1 ml in order to sufficiently moisten the applicator region.

11. Claims 30 – 32, 35 – 38, 45, 49 – 52, 54, 71, 73, 74, 76 and 81 - 83 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,358,231 to Schindler et al.

In regard to claims 30 – 32, 35 – 38, 45, 49 – 52, 54, 71, 73, 74, 76 and 81 – 83, Zhang et al. discloses a plurality of applicators containing different test substances (Col. 5, lines 20 – 25) each applicator comprising: a tube (40); a plug inside the tube (58); and at least one test substance (48) contained in an inside space of the tube defined at a first end by the plug, the plug being arranged, in use, to be expelled together with the test substance when said test substance leaves the inside space of the tube (Figure 3). Zhang et al. discloses a tube, wherein the inside space is defined at a second end (46), remote from the first, by a breakable portion (42). Zhang et al. discloses a kit, wherein the applicator includes a retaining element for retaining the breakable portion on the applicator after it has been broken off (Figure 3, 42). Zhang et al. discloses a kit, wherein the tube (40) is provided at one end with an applicator element (72), the applicator element being separated from the test substance prior to use, by the plug (Figure 2, 58). Zhang et al. discloses a kit, wherein the applicator element (72) is selected from the group consisting of a cotton bud (Column 5, line 62 – Column 6, lines 3), a foam bud, a felt tip, a flocked bud, and a tip made of ceramic or of sintered material.

Art Unit: 3736

Zhang et al. discloses a kit, wherein the tube is free of an applicator element (Figure 1). Zhang et al. discloses a kit, wherein the plug comprises a liquid, and wherein said liquid is selected from the group consisting of mineral oils, fluorine-containing substances, and silicones (Column 5, lines 44 – 47). Zhang et al. discloses at least three applicators having different test substances (Col. 5, lines 20 – 25) including pharmaceutical substances. However, Zhang et al. fails to disclose the pharmaceutical substances being at least two substances with at least one compound at concentrations varying by a factor of at least two from one to another nor a stimulating agent for stimulating a peripheral nervous system. Nor does Zhang et al. disclose packaging in which the applicators are housed. Schindler et al. discloses a kit having a plurality of applicators housed in a housing, wherein the housing includes at least one compartment configured to receive a single applicator or a plurality of applicators (Figure 7). Schindler et al. teaches the use at least two substances with at least one compound at concentrations varying by a factor of at least two from one to another, the substance being a stimulating agent for stimulating a peripheral nervous system (Col. 1, lines 58 – 63). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the kit as disclosed by Zhang et al. to include a packaging having compartments as taught by Schindler et al. in order to keep the applicators sterile and from moving around during transport. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the substances as disclosed by Zhang et al. to include a stimulating agent in varying concentrations as taught by Schindler et al. in order to anesthetize the eye, mouth or ear of a patient as needed. (Col. 1, lines 45 – 67).

12. Claims 39, 40 and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,358,231 to Schindler et al. as applied to claims 30 and 71 above, and further in view of Zygmunt (US Patent No. 6,488,646).



In regard to claims 39 and 77, Zhang et al. in view of Schindler et al. discloses a packaging for at least one applicator. However, Zhang et al. in view of Schindler et al. does not disclose at least one bag for packaging at least one applicator. Zygmunt discloses one bag (2) for packaging at least one applicator (Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention in view of Zygmunt to enclose a bag around an applicator with Zhang et al. in view of Schindler et al. in order to keep each applicator sterile.

In regard to claim 40, Zhang et al. in view of Schindler et al. and further in view of Zygmunt discloses the claimed invention except for a string of bags each containing at least one applicator. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a string of bags for each of the applicators, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

13. Claims 41 and 42, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,358,231 to Schindler et al. as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of Barabino et al. (US Patent No. 4,740,194).

In regard to claims 41 and 42, Zhang et al. in view of Schindler et al. disclose an applicator that is labeled (Column 2, lines 57-58). However, Zhang et al. in view of Schindler et al. does not disclose each applicator includes at least one mark corresponding to at least one of a type of test substance inside the tube and a concentration of a compound contained in the test substance. However, Barabino et al. discloses each applicator includes at least one mark comprising one of an alphanumeric symbol and a color corresponding to at least one of a type of test substance inside the tube and a concentration of a compound contained in the test substance (Column 6, lines 6-8). It

Art Unit: 3736

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention in view of Barabino et al. to include a marking on each applicator with Zhang et al. in view of Schindler et al. in order to differentiate applicators and their respective content.

14. Claims 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,358,231 to Schindler et al. as applied to claim 30 above , and further in view of Tobin et al. (US Patent No. 3,792,699).

In regard to claims 43 and 44, Zhang et al. in view of Schindler et al. fails to disclose the substance in each tube having a volume in a range from 0.01 ml to 5 ml or 0.05 ml to 1 ml. Tobin et al., however, discloses a kit, wherein the tube has a volume in the range of 0.01 ml to 5 ml or 0.05 ml to 1 ml (Column 3, lines 20-25). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in view of Tobin et al. to modify the volume of the tubes as disclosed by Zhang et al. in view of Schindler et al. to be the range from 0.01 ml to 5 ml or 0.05 ml to 1 ml in order to sufficiently moisten the applicator region.

15. Claims 31 – 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barr et al. (US Patent No. 6,812,254).

In regards to claims 31 - 35, Zhang et al. discloses a plurality of applicators containing different test substances (Col. 5, lines 20 – 25) each applicator comprising: a tube (40); a plug inside the tube (58); and at least one test substance (48) contained in an inside space of the tube defined at a first end by the plug, the plug being arranged, in use, to be expelled together with the test substance when said test substance leaves the inside space of the tube (Figure 3). Zhang et al. discloses a kit capable of comprising pharmaceutical products (Abstract). However, Zhang et al. does not disclose a kit comprising at least two test substances with at least one compound at varying

Art Unit: 3736

concentrations. Barr et al., however, discloses a kit comprising at least two test substances with a substance capable of being at varying concentrations (Column 3, lines 44-65 & Column 7, line 40 – Column 8, line 38). The substances include a stimulating agent for stimulating a peripheral nervous system (Abstract & Column 4, lines 5-23). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention in view of Barr et al. to have different test substances with varying concentrations with Zhang et al. in order to administer varying levels of treatment for pains and discomforts (Column 1, lines 6 – 12). The stimulating agent for stimulating the peripheral nervous system is selected from the group consisting of natural or synthetic capsaicinoids, homocapsaicin, homodihydrocapsaicin, nordihydrocapsaicin, dihydrocapsaicin; lactic acid, glycolic acid, ethanol at a concentration greater than 50%, mustard seed oil (Barr et al., Column 3, lines 14-18). A concentration of the stimulating agent for stimulating the peripheral nervous system lies in a range from 10-6% to 10-2% by weight (Barr et al., Column 3, lines 45-65).

16. Claim 75 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,358,231 to Schindler et al. as applied to claim 71 above, and further in view of Lewis and further in view of Ohsumi (US Patent No. 5,658,981).

In regard to claim 75, Zhang et al. in view of Schindler et al. fail to disclose each tube further comprises a thermoreversible thickener inside the volume. Ohsumi, however, teaches the use of thermoreversible thickener (Abstract & Column 1, lines 43-52). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention in view of Ohsumi to add thermoreversible thickener to the volume with Zhang et al. in view of Schindler et al. in order to control aqueous solutions, which thicken rapidly within a narrow temperature range (Column 1, lines 43-52).

17. Claims 78 and 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,358,231 to Schindler et al. as applied to claim 71 above, and further in

Art Unit: 3736

view of Lewis (US Patent No. 5,947,986).

In regard to claims 78 and 79, Zhang et al. in view of Schindler et al. disclose a packaging, but fail to disclose the packaging having a stand; a body mounted on the stand and a closure cap coupled to the body of the portions of tubes extending outside the body. However, Lewis discloses a packaging including a stand (Lewis, 52); and a body (Lewis, 56) mounted on said stand. Each tube in the packaging (Lewis, 12) has a portion extending outside said body (Lewis, 56), and a closure cap (Lewis, 60) coupled to said body and over said portions. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the packaging as disclosed by Zhang et al. in view of Schindler et al. to include a body, stand and cap as taught by Lewis in order to make the tubes more easily accessed by the user.

### *Response to Arguments*

18. Applicant's arguments filed 12/28/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant asserts that Zhang et al. fails to disclose a plurality of applicators containing different test substances. However, the Examiner disagrees. Zhang et al. teaches a plurality of applicators containing different test substances (Col. 5, lines 19 – 25).

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan ML Foreman whose telephone number is (571)272-4724. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Max Hindenburg can be reached on (571)272-4726. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3736

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



JMLF



MONTY LINDEBURG  
SENIOR PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700